DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 055 132 UD 011 824

TITLE Hearing Before the Subcommittee on Housing and Youth Affairs of the Committee on the District of Columbia, House of Representatives, Ninety-Second Congress, First Session on H. Con. Res. 172. School Attendance. Hearing Held Washington, D.C., May 24, 1971.

INSTITUTION Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. House Committee on the District of Columbia.

PUB DATE [May 71]

NOTE 15p.; Committee Print, House Committee on the District of Columbia

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29

DESCRIPTORS *Attendance Patterns; *Federal Government; Government Employees; Government Role; *Public Education; *Public Schools; *Public School Systems

IDENTIFIERS District Of Columbia

ABSTRACT

In this hearing, Congressman John R. Rarick (Louisiana) helped put forth a concurrent resolution that each officer or employee of the Federal Government residing and working in the District of Columbia should send his children to the D. C. Public Schools. Congressman Rarick, and William Robinson from the District of Columbia government, were among those who testified. Letters relevant to the resolution were submitted for the record. (JW)

J

F Cong

SCHOOL ATTENDANCE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: UD EA
In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING AND YOUTH AFFAIRS

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETY-SECOND CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

H. Con. Res. 172

THAT IT IS THE SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT EACH OFFICER OR EMPLOYEE OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT RESIDING AND WORKING IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SHOULD SEND HIS CHILDREN TO THE D.C. PUBLIC SCHOOLS

MAY 24, 1971

Printed for the use of the
Committee on the District of Columbia

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
63-715 WASHINGTON : 1971

ED 055132
UD 011824

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

JOHN L. MCMILLIAN, South Carolina, *Chairman*

THOMAS G. ABERNATHY, Mississippi
JOHN DOWDY, Texas
CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR., Michigan
G. ELLIOTT HAGAN, Georgia
DONALD M. FRASER, Minnesota
ANDREW JACOBS, JR., Indiana
WILLIAM L. HUNGATE, Missouri
EARLE CABELL, Texas
RAY BLANTON, Tennessee
W. S. STUCKEY, JR., Georgia
ABNER J. MIKVA, Illinois
ARTHUR A. LINK, North Dakota
RONALD V. DELLUMS, California

WALTER E. FAUNTROY,
Delegate, District of Columbia

ANCHER NELSEN, Minnesota
WILLIAM L. SPRINGER, Illinois
ALVIN E. O'KONSKI, Wisconsin
WILLIAM H. HARSHA, Ohio
JOEL T. BROYHILL, Virginia
GILBERT GUDE, Maryland
VERNON W. THOMSON, Wisconsin
HENRY P. SMITH III, New York
EARL F. LANDGREBE, Indiana
STEWART B. MCKINNEY, Connecticut

JAMES T. CLARK, *Clerk*
CLAYTO S. GASQUE, *Staff Director*
HAYDEN S. GARBER, *Counsel*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING AND YOUTH AFFAIRS

W. S. STUCKEY, Georgia, *Chairman*

CHARLES DIGGS, Michigan
EARLE CABELL, Texas
ABNER MIKVA, Illinois
RONALD DELLUMS, California

WALTER E. FAUNTROY,
Delegate, District of Columbia

JOEL T. BROYHILL, Virginia
GILBERT GUDE, Maryland
HENRY P. SMITH III, New York
EARL LANDGREBE, Indiana
STEWART MCKINNEY, Connecticut

CONTENTS

	Page
H. Con. 172 (Rarick), a concurrent resolution that it is the sense of Congress that each officer or employee of the Federal Government residing and working in the District of Columbia should send his children to the D.C. Public Schools	1

STATEMENTS

District of Columbia Government:	
Dickinson Neil, Research Assistant, D.C. Public Schools	11
Robinson, William, Assistant Corporation Counsel	10
Rarick, Hon. John R., Representative in Congress from the State of Louisiana	1

MATERIAL SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

District Government, Graham W. Watt, Assistant to Commissioner, letter dated June 4, 1971 to the Chairman	11
Louisiana School Boards Association, Dr. R. McIntyre Bridges, letter June 4, 1971 to the Chairman	10
Rafferty, Dr. Max, former Superintendent of Education, California, statement	9

D.C. SCHOOL ATTENDANCE

MONDAY, MAY 24, 1971

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING AND YOUTH AFFAIRS OF THE
COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, D.C.

The Subcommittee met at 2:30 p.m. in Room 1310, Longworth House Office Building, the Honorable W. S. Stuckey, Jr. (Chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Members present: Representatives Stuckey (Chairman), Dellums, Broyhill, Gude, Smith of New York, and Landgrebe; also Delegate Fauntroy.

Also present: James T. Clark, Clerk; Hayden S. Garber, Counsel; John Hogan, Minority Clerk; and Leonard O. Hilder, Legislative Assistant.

Mr. STUCKEY. We will now consider House Concurrent Resolution No. 172, concerning school attendance by children of officers or employees of the Federal Government residing and working in Washington.

(The resolution is as follows:)

[H. Con. 172, 92d Cong., 1st Sess., by Mr. Rarick, February 18, 1971]

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it the sense of Congress that each officer or employee of the Federal Government who is residing and working in the District of Columbia and who has a child qualified to attend an elementary or secondary school should send such a child to an elementary or secondary school in the public school system of the District of Columbia.

We will hear first from our colleague, the Honorable John R. Rarick.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN R. RARICK, REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF LOUISIANA

Mr. RARICK. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, members of the committee.

I am very happy to be here today and have this chance to speak on House Concurrent Resolution No. 172 which I feel is very necessary to the educational system in the Nation's Capital.

I remind the members of the subcommittee briefly what this resolution would do. It would make it the sense of Congress that every officer or Federal employee who lives and works in the District of Columbia for the Federal Government and who has a child qualified

to attend the elementary or secondary schools, place that child in a public school in the District of Columbia.

Since I am a Southerner, it may seem unusual that I introduced this bill. We have experienced many racial problems in my district as many of you have had in yours. If we had tolerated the situation which exists here in our Nation's Capital, however, I can frankly tell you that we would have been denied Federal funds and our educators would have incurred the wrath of the Justice Department and HEW. Likewise, many of our liberal friends would have attacked us unmercifully as perpetuating segregation and being racist.

Quite recently the School Superintendent of the District, Hugh J. Scott, warned the American people that a state of anarchy exists in the District's 190-some public schools. Fifty-one of the public schools in our Nation's Capital do not have any "other than Negro" students in attendance. The record shows that of 143,763 students there are 136,364 Negroes and 7,399 other than Negro. 60.3 percent of the other than Negro are enrolled in 14 schools, at which the other than Negro students consttiute at least 50 percent of the total enrollment.

Mr. STUCKEY. Are these 14 schools within the District?

Mr. RARICK. Within the District's 191 schools, yes. Of the 191, fifty-one have no white students. Of the 191, fourteen schools at present have 60 percent plus of the other than Negro students.

We in Congress are sitting in the center of Washington, D.C., our Nation's Capital, the home of the Supreme Court which has made so many landmark decisions in the field of racial education, the nerve center of HEW and the Justice Department, and, of course, the working area of literally thousands and thousands of Federal people who flee every night to the suburbs. And even among the few who live in the District, very few place their children in the D.C. public schools.

If the educational guidelines and court rulings on public education as forced into compliance in my district were to apply here in our Nation's Capital, all Federal funds would be immediately cut off.

In March of this year I had written Mr. Elliot Richardson, Secretary of HEW, to call to his attention that the latest school statistics show a serious imbalance in racial attendance in D.C. public schools and that I was receiving inquiries from my constituents wondering if he had contemplated cutting off the Federal funds from the D.C. schools. Such equal enforcement would result in a catastrophe. Nevertheless, it is a strange double standard that with the efforts to achieve mathematical racial balance in the public schools in certain areas of our nation, nothing is being done in Washington, D.C. to achieve racial balance. If racial balance is a national goal, then our Nation's Capital should reflect a cross-section of the racial minorities in our entire country.

Lo and behold, over a month later I received this letter from Mr. Richardson in which he indicates that the only authority his Department has to require school desegregation is under provisions of Title 6 of the Civil Rights Act, which he feels provides that any school district is considered to be in compliance with this Act if it is subject to a final order of a court of the United States with the desegregation of the school and provides an assurance that it will comply with such order.

Secretary Richardson feels that inasmuch as the District of Columbia is desegregating under an order of the U.S. District Court in the

case of Hobson versus Hansen it qualifies under this provision. Yet statistics show that last year there were fifty schools which had no other than Negro students while this year there are 51 all black schools. Yet the D.C. system is held to be in compliance. I insert a copy of Secretary Richardson's letter of April 5 at this point of my testimony.

The thrust of my bill, H. Con. Res. 172, is that those who actually believe in the theory of racial balance, and those who feel we turn the country upside down to have a fully integrated society, certainly should support this resolution. Adoption of this resolution would show the American people that the leaders here in our Nation's Capital are big enough to voluntarily participate in the policies, the laws and edicts by making our Nation's Capital a model showplace of racial balance. Thus proving to the people around our Nation that their elected leaders are not hypocrites, that we are not going to openly defy the laws that bureaucrats here are making, that we will voluntarily submit to educational standards our people are forced to comply with in other parts of our country.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple resolution. It does not force anyone to place his children in the public schools. I think it is merely a moral commitment of the Congress that we, including the Federal bureaucrats, the Federal judges, HEW people, and decisionmakers of our country, should certainly put up or shut up. Adoption of this resolution will not force compliance. Federal officials and employees will act in a voluntary manner to show our people at home that we can live under the same laws they are forced to abide by.

I hope the Subcommittee will pass this resolution. I assure you I want to vote for it.

Thank you very much.

Mr. STUCKEY. Thank you, Mr. Rarick.

Mr. FAUNTROY. As you may know, one of reasons for the racial composition of our schools in the District has been that the alleged quality of education offered over a period of years has suffered from lack of income over those years. I wonder whether or not your resolution might be amended to indicate that all persons who worked in the District of Columbia for the Federal Government, including Congressmen, would contribute by way of income taxes to the District of Columbia, which would really make it easier to deal with the problem of quality education. If you assure me that that kind of sense of the Congress could be put into a bill, you would have my firm and full support.

Mr. RARICK. Am I to believe that unless the resolution is amended to include voluntary income taxes, you would oppose this resolution?

Mr. FAUNTROY. Let me assure you it would not be voluntary.

Mr. RARICK. I introduced this resolution the early part of February. I believe there are 13 members on the Black Caucus. I have had no offers to co-author this bill. Nor have any white liberals approached me with offers to join in support of this resolution.

Now you come up with the idea that unless we amend it to include income taxes you may not be able to support it. I am shocked by your statement.

Let me say this. I pay my taxes. Every time there is a House District Bill on Appropriations and it passes I think that I do pay taxes for D.C. schools.

If the people are encouraged to bring their children back to the District of Columbia I think we will see a mass migration back to our Nation's Capital. That is, those who are legislators, the Federal employees, and those who are about the business of our country. If we can bring this caliber of people back into our Nation's Capital, I feel there will be a substantial rise in revenues. If the people return with their children to the Nation's Capital and are concerned with the condition of the schools, they themselves will be the best masters of what is needed. Most parents are very sensitive about the educational needs of their children. That is reflected in the variations among schools around our country.

Mr. FAUNTROY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BROYHILL. The gentleman from the District and I are in agreement on one portion of the suggested amendment, and that is that if we adopt this so-called reciprocal tax, to tax the incomes of all those working in the District of Columbia, it should include Members of Congress as well. I do not see where there should be any exception for Members of Congress, their staffs, or anyone else if we go on the premise that all people who work in the District of Columbia should pay income taxes to the city.

I want to point out that if that amendment is ever attached to any bill, I will fight with all I have to be sure that Members of Congress are included. I am glad to have the—I won't say assurance—but the statement that the gentleman from the District of Columbia support that view.

Did I understand you to say this is voluntary compliance?

Mr. RARICK. Sense of Congress, yes.

Mr. BROYHILL. Although I agree with what you are getting at here, there has been a lot of hypocrisy in the District and amoung our national leaders for a long time. Mr. Dellums said, let us put our cards on the table. There is a problem regarding this financial situation. Many communities have residents who send their children to private schools, and to parochial school as well, not to avoid integration or because of racial problems but because they just feel the children can get a better education in private schools.

If your legislation is enacted, it will cost a lot of money in the District of Columbia because of many children who will then attend public schools rather than private schools.

We already have a problem in raising enough revenue for this city as it is. Do you have an idea what this additional public school population will cost the city?

Mr. RARICK. I do not. But as I had said earlier, most parents will place their hearts and pocketbooks where their children are. If we can reverse the migration from our Nation's Capital—we will return a greater revenue source and we may find that these people will start demanding higher local taxes and the closing of tax loopholes. Taxes are looked on as an evil, mainly because many taxpayers disapprove of the way the money is spent. The original tax idea was a community pooling of funds to accomplish worthwhile purposes. Today the great opposition to taxes, especially on income, is that the working productive people do not approve of the way their tax dollars are being spent.

I find in Washington, D.C. our Nation's Capital, that visiting foreigners and tourists are surprised that the Federal City does not reflect a racial cross-section of the United States.

There are many private schools in my district. Many have come into being since 1954. All these private schools are financed by parents who have already paid for and are still paying for public schools. Some seek to avoid racial integration, others look for quality education which they do not feel is available in the federally dominated public schools. Again we may have to upgrade the public schools if this is the problem and reassure such parents that we have something to offer in education. If people are to drive from Virginia or Maryland to Washington to enter their children in D.C. schools it will only be because they are better, safer, and offer an education.

Mr. BROYHILL. Several years ago that was the case, and people in Virginia were getting permission to send their children to District public schools.

You also state in your resolution, and I am not offering an amendment, that people who live in the District of Columbia and work fo the Federal Government should do this. How about those who resi in the District of Columbia but work in the suburbs?

Mr. RARICK. I would be most happy to suggest to the committee that you amend the resolution from "and" to "or."

Mr. BROYHILL. You would agree to that as an amendment?

Mr. RARICK. Yes.

Mr. FAUNTROY. I am pleased to know that the distinguished gentleman from Virginia would be for a commuter tax, a reciprocal tax, if the Members of the Congress were to agree to a District tax. is that what I understand?

Mr. BROYHILL. I will check the record and if I said that we will correct that record promptly.

What I intended to say—and I think the gentleman misinterpreted me purposely, but this is all right since we are talking on the lighter side—is that if we do consider a reciprocal tax, to tax the income of non-residents working in the District of Columbia then by all means Members of Congress should be included. There should be no exceptions. I would insist upon that but I would still vote against the measure even with that provision included. Congress would be subjected to severe criticism if they were to impose that type of tax upon persons working here and living elsewhere, but exempting themselves from that tax.

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Dellums?

Mr. DELLUMS. Will you succinctly tell me the motivation for putting this resolution before us? I listened carefully to your testimony, but I am trying to get at your motivation for this resolution. Why go through this?

Mr. RARICK. Basically to point out, as Mr. Broyhill said, the hypocrisy of some of our liberal egalitarian friends here in Washington. On the other hand because my people feel most strongly that if they must forcefully submit their children to equal integration in their public schools—a ratio component of attendance based upon race—then certainly those encouraging and supporting such federal action should show their good faith by leading the way. If those who claim to be spokesmen are going to be leaders, then let them lead by example. They should believe in equal justice.

The Supreme Court has dodged equal justice nationwide by talking "defacto" and "dejure". Yet anyone who studies history knows that President Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation did not free slaves in the District of Columbia, in fact, not even the slaves in Maryland.

How then can these areas be held to be "defacto" and not "dejure"?

At the time of the Brown decision in 1954 there was a supplemental decision wherein the Supreme Court also struck down laws requiring segregation right here in our Nation's Capital. The Brown case itself involved Kansas segregation laws. So any exclusion from the equal applications of the social justice laws is but a political play on words. I am not suggesting use of force by my resoution. I am saying if the decision makers are to be leaders and they urge forced racial balance in other parts of our country, then let them display the courage to lead the way in our Nation's Capital. Let them make this city truly a democratic showplace of racial balance so people can look to Washington and say they are doing it in Washington, D.C. They are practicing what they preach. Let the people say if they can do it there, and those are our leaders, then we can do it here at home. Hypocrites who do unto others as they would not do unto themselves do not inspire respect or confidence. This is my motivation. If we are to have equal justice, let us be sincere.

Mr. DELLUMS. Can you tell me if there is any jurisdiction in the United States that is required to integrate schools outside a given educational jurisdiction? For example, I come from Berkeley, California where we have an extraordinary integration program. 35 percent of that community is black, 40 percent of each school in that city is *intagrated*.

We never forced anybody to go to Oakland. We never even suggested they go to Oakland for the purpose of integration.

Can you tell me whether there is any place in the country where people cross jurisdictional lines for the purpose of integrating schools?

Mr. RARICK. You refer to the force decision in the Hobson-Hansen case. I can't answer your question. I cannot say first-hand that I know of any instance.

But with the new busing edicts requiring fleets of new buses and busdrivers we may need consider hiring a fleet of airplanes, maybe using military bombers to handle integration across jurisdictional lines. Then we could fly our people from Mississippi, Georgia, and Alabama, and achieve racial balance in Minnesota, Vermont, South Dakota. Vermont has only 750 Negroes in the whole State. I don't think the law has gone that far yet, but certainly if racial balance in public schools is a national goal then we should not stop at State lines. If it is to be the law then any time there is a higher rate of Negroes than white by national average the law is violated. But I do not believe the Supreme Court has even dreamed to this extreme. Yet, anyway.

Interestingly enough under the Genocide Convention, it considered an act of genocide to forcefully transfer the children of one group to another with intent to destroy the identity of that group. Forceful transfer by busing to achieve racial balance can but be intended to destroy the identity of two groups. This is especially suspect since it is massively being carried out primarily in the South.

Mr. DELLUMS. If children end their school day at three o'clock, 12 noon for kindergarten, Federal employees get off from 4:30 to 6:30 in the evening, it would mean we would require some child care facilities in order to take care of the children during that time span. Would you be willing to support a comprehensive child care bill for the entire nation which would include services to the children who would be coming in?

Mr. RARICK. I am here today talking about racial balance in the schools in our Nation's Capital. I am not even talking about taxes. I am trying to get a voluntary agreement with the members that federal officers and employees put their children in public schools in D.C.

If we change the racial composition of the schools in the District, and the problem you discuss handicaps education, we still have school teachers and educational facilities available. The teachers can use the buildings to perform the same services you suggest. I am not a member of the District Committee and I don't know what facilities now exist or are needed for extra parental child care.

Mr. DELLUMS. I would like to make a brief comment. The reason I asked the latter question is this: Obviously to implement this kind of policy certain nuances would exist. I wonder whether you thought it through far enough to make commitments. It is obvious from your answer you have not gone that far.

This is a community of 750,000 people. 73 percent of them are black. I come from a State 2,500 miles away, so some of my statements will be speculation but not far wrong. This community is 73 percent black because there are a lot of people who have left this community because they have not been willing to deal with the serious and critical problems confronting the District as a major urban city. They have walked away from this city not only because of educational factors but because we have not addressed ourselves to other critical issues confronting us.

I will not play games with you. I honestly believe your resolution does not address itself to that problem in any way. If we are talking about the quality of life and education of the people in the District then we are talking about spending substantial sums of money to deal with all those critical issues—the questions of mass transit, employment, poverty, hunger, disease, and education in this District so we make the District of Columbia a model city.

But if this Congress was willing to pass a piece of my legislation that I think was called a crime bill which is a violation of constitutional rights, it seems to me we can in fact make Washington, D.C. a model urban city for the entire United States.

You would not deal with that in this kind or resolution in a strange way—a few people having the courage to stand up. You do not address yourself to the quality of life. You address the quality of life by people being courageous enough to deal with critical problems and be willing to stop spending so much money killing people elsewhere in the world and start dealing with the problems of building a community that is worthy of black, brown, red, yellow, and white. Your resolution does not address itself to that issue.

Until we deal with that you are not getting to the real contradiction. We in Congress have all the fringe benefits and amenities that accrue our "stations in life" but if we advocate these ideas to working classes, races in the North and others, it is a radical conspiracy. That is the contradiction and hypocrisy we have to deal with. I don't think your resolution deals with that at all.

If we enhance the quality of life in the District you will not have to pass a resolution for people to come in. One of the tragedies I see in coming from the California educational system is that I see a tremendous commitment to private institutions and not a real commitment to public institutions. I have that commitment. My children are in public

education and I will fight to see this becomes the best educational system in the country because I have a vested interest not only in my own children but other human beings.

You do not deal with those problems in this resolution. If you are willing to join me on the Floor of Congress to fight for more money for education, more money to solve problems of crime, unemployment, poverty, hunger and disease than I would consider you a real civil libertarian, a person concerned about equal justice. We do not have it in this District or in this country until we deal with that.

Your resolution giving a kind of perfunctory approach to dealing with hypocrisy, you are not dealing with real hypocrisy of this country. When you do I will join you and we will join hands and say we are fighting for equal justice. Your resolution does not do that.

Mr. BROYHILL. This resolution does not require people who reside outside the District to send their children into the District of Columbia?

Mr. RARICK. No. I earlier said I would have no objection to the Committee's amendment to change "and" to "or". But there is no requirement.

Mr. BROYHILL. I have a question about children in Berkeley going to Oakland.

Mr. DELLUMS. I am sorry.

Mr. BROYHILL. It says in the resolution work and reside, work for the Federal Government and reside. I asked a question about those who reside in the District and work for the Federal Government outside.

In your testimony, you did say something about sending children into the District of Columbia, did you not?

Mr. RARICK. I was asked if I knew of such a jurisdiction where there was boundary crossing by compulsion. I know of no such action by force of law.

This resolution makes any pupil assignment voluntary. It is intended as a good faith commitment by those who espouse racial balance.

If I had not been here and heard it with my own ears I would not believe the statement I just heard.

Mr. BROYHILL. What is the situation now?

Mr. RARICK. White people have fled for safety to the suburbs, increasing the imbalance in the D.C. schools. The member from California said the District is now 73 percent Negro. His suggestion offers no hope for change. Rather to maintain a status quo. The only way Washington, D.C. can ever become a model city is for the racial makeup to be representative of our country. A racial balance of 11 percent colored to 89 percent white, which can be accomplished only by determined and positive action by those who helped set in motion the forces which have resulted in racial imbalance.

If those at the helm of our Nation who live and work in the Nation's Capital feel that they have at least a moral commitment to the rest of the American people to make this a model city then we can have a racially balanced federal District to house the government of the United States.

One drives to the suburbs in Virginia and in Maryland and sees only whites. One drives in Washington and it is predominately black. We have become the laughing stock of our own people. We have surrendered our Nation's Capital to a minority control over the seat of

their government. It is time we re-established a semblance of national balance.

Mr. STUCKEY. Further questions?

Mr. RARICK. Several educators had indicated a desire to testify in support of H. Con. Res. 172, but were unable to be present on such short notice. I ask that the statement of Dr. Max Rafferty, former Superintendent of Education of the State of California, and now with the Department of Education in Alabama, along with a letter from Dr. R. McIntyre Bridges, President of the Louisiana School Boards Association, be inserted at this point.

Mr. STUCKEY. Thank you.

Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. RARICK. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

(The matters referred to by Mr. Rarick follow:)

PUBLIC STATEMENT OF DR. MAX RAFFERTY, FORMER SUPERINTENDENT OF EDUCATION, CALIFORNIA, ON H.C.R. 172

The assumption has been made by the courts and by many legislators in this Congress that ethnic balance in a given school situation will in itself produce better education for the pupils enrolled in that school. Whatever the political and sociological implications of forced integration may be, as an educator I can testify that desegregation alone and without other qualifying factors does not, cannot, and will not result in better education for anyone. Integration accompanied by smaller class sizes will lead to improved results. Integration followed by better books, finer teachers, and improved curriculum will bring about superior pupil competence. Integration which brings with it an emphasis on Education in Depth instead of pragmatic permissive Progressive Education will certainly be a vast improvement and a true windfall for children fortunate enough to experience it.

But *any* change which brings into a school smaller class sizes, better books, finer teachers, improved curriculum, and Education in Depth will produce an immense change for the better insofar as the educational output of that school is concerned. Desegregation in and by itself produces no instructional benefits at all. Neither, incidentally, does segregation. Either condition is simply irrelevant to true education. Justification for mandated ethnic balance in a school must be found outside of education. A school with more interesting books and more inspirational teachers will be a better school than one without, and it doesn't matter in the slightest whether the student body is black, white, brown, yellow, or polka-dotted.

The courts, despite all this, have decreed that ethnic balance shall prevail, and until this interpretation of the Constitution, unknown until our own generation, gives way to another, it is the duty of parents and children, teachers and school boards, to obey the law. My own State of Alabama has done its duty in this respect, and will continue to do so. Members of the two houses of Congress in addition to the judiciary and the Federal bureaucracy, however, have a duty over and beyond that of mere concurrence with the court's decrees. That duty is to set a salutary example from which their constituents may profit. It is this duty to which H.C.R. 172 addresses itself.

Logic as applied to the principle of ethnic balance in the schools is inexorable. Either compulsory desegregation is good for all American school children or it is not. The official governmental assumption must now be that it is. Therefore, to confer its benefits upon their own families, as well as to perform a needed act of leadership which will inspire general compliance with the latest constitutional interpretation on the part of all parents in the land, congressmen and other Federal officers who have supported the principle of ethnic balance should now enroll their children in the mixed public schools of the District of Columbia.

It is common knowledge that such enrollment is not now the case. A regrettably infinitesimal pedcentage of Federal offspring are currently attending the public schools of this city, despite the need to set an example coupled with the undeniable fact that the Washington schools are controlled and financed by the Congress itself. This latter fact should serve as an additional and important reason for legislators and other officials to send their own children to what are, in a very real sense, their own public schools.

[illegible]

Failure on the part of this House to abide by the tenets and the philosophy embodied by H.C.R. 172 would be inconceivable, if only because it would place members of Congress in a posture of detestable hypocrisy. Surely, if it is our government's position that America's children should attend racially integrated schools, the families of congressmen should—like Abou Ben Adhem—lead all the rest. Enrollment of those same families in exclusive private schools, unexceptionable enough for an ordinary citizen, is unacceptable for a member of a government which is presently pushing ethnic quotas and mass busing upon millions of Americans who cannot afford this easy way out of a dilemma created by the Federal government itself. To say to those millions, "Your children will have to live in the situation which we have devised for you, but ours will be allowed to escape the consequences" would be to set up a dual standard of conduct which would constitute the champion cop-out of the twentieth century.

I support H.C.R. 172 because I support our Congress. Especially for those members who have been vocally indefatigable in their defense of the High Court's recent decision, here is an absolutely golden opportunity to put their children where their mouths have been—bearing witness to all the advantages attendant upon forced ethnic balance in America's schools.

LOUISIANA SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION,
Baton Rouge, Louisiana, June 4, 1971.

CHAIRMAN,
Committee on District of Columbia,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: It is my desire to address the committee concerning House Concurrent Resolution 172. This Resolution asks that each officer or employee of the federal government who is residing or working in the District of Columbia and who has a child qualified to attend elementary or secondary school should send such child to the public schools of the District of Columbia.

Mr. Chairman, the necessity of such a resolution strikes me as the height of hypocrisy and to think that in our nation's capitol there are those employed who blatently disregard the law of the land. How can we expect the people of this great country to respect our federal institutions when the employees openly defy the law in our nation's capitol. Washington, D.C. was to be the hallmark for the elimination of discrimination in public education. Because of the racist views of federal employees, the public school system of Washington, D.C. has become 90% black.

How ironic for those who run around the country from Washington, D.C. being employed by H.E.W. and the Justice Department shouting from every crook and cranny that racism must end in the south within public education, while they at the same time send their children to segregated schools for the most parts in adjoining states to our capitol or to some private school.

We must ask ourselves how our nation's capitol is allowed to become a black capitol in regard to public education with so many of the federal employees being of the white race. Certainly one must admit there are severe double standards and can we allow the same people who draw up the guidelines for public education in the south to blatently fail to follow their own guidelines in Washington, D.C. One marvels at the respect for the law by the people in the south over the past two years, and can this respect continue in the failure of our nation's leaders to condemn those racists within the nation's capitol.

I do not seek the moon, but only pray that reason will prevail at home and the nation's capitol as well.

Respectfully yours,

R. MCINTYRE BRIDGES, M.D., FACS.

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM ROBINSON, ASSISTANT CORPORATION COUNSEL OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. ROBINSON. I present the letter of the D.C. government respecting House Concurrent Resolution 172, as follows:

21 St. 13

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, D.C., May 24, 1971.

Hon. JOHN L. MCMILLAN,
Chairman, Committee on the District of Columbia, United States House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MCMILLAN: The Commissioner of the District of Columbia has for report H. Con. Res. 172.

The resolution expresses the sense of Congress that each officer or employee of the Federal Government who is residing and working in the District of Columbia and who has a child qualified to attend an elementary or secondary school should send such child to an elementary or secondary school in the public school system of the District of Columbia.

In the belief that a strong public school system, supported by the community as a whole, is a desirable objective, and in light of the fact that the resolution expresses only the sense of the Congress and does not impose any mandatory requirement upon the school system, the Commissioner of the District of Columbia has no objection to the enactment of H. Con. Res. 172.

Sincerely yours,

GRAHAM W. WATT,
Assistant to the Commissioner.
For: WALTER E. WASHINGTON,
Commissioner.

Mr. ROBINSON. I am accompanied by Mr. Neil Dickman, of the Public School System, who also has a statement to read with respect to the resolution.

STATEMENT OF NEIL DICKMAN, RESEARCH ASSISTANT, D.C. PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. DICKMAN. Mr. John D. Koontz, associate superintendent for Administrative Services was not able to be here, so I should like to read his statement, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee: House Concurrent Resolution 172 provides that "it is the sense of Congress that each officer or employee of the Federal Government who is residing and working in the District of Columbia and who has a child qualified to attend an elementary or secondary school should send such child to an elementary or secondary school in the public school system of the District of Columbia."

While there may be merit in such a resolution, we believe that it raises several problems which should receive close scrutiny by this Subcommittee. First, it may introduce a coercive element into Federal employment which is contrary to the individual right of such employee to send his child to a private or parochial school if he so chooses.

Secondly, the resolution appears to single out Federal employees who live and work in the District from other Federal employees who live and work in other jurisdictions. These first two points while not directly affecting the D.C. Public Schools does affect Federal employment and should, we suggest, be considered by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee as well as this Committee.

Lastly, if all those children who fall within the purview of this resolution and are not now in the District of Columbia Public School System were to suddenly be required by law, regulation or otherwise to attend this school system, we estimate that our budget needs (ignoring any increased benefits from Impact Aid) would be increased by approximately 4.2 to 5.8 million dollars. In addition to increased expenditure requirements, overcrowding and administrative difficulties would also present serious problems.

We, therefore, respectfully request that careful consideration be given to these points before acting on this resolution.

Mr. STUCKEY. Any questions?

(No response.)

Mr. STUCKEY. Thank you very much.

I would like to go back into session at 10 o'clock tomorrow to hear the D.C. Metropolitan Board of Trade, which was unable to be here today.

(Whereupon, at 5:15 p.m. Monday, May 24, 1971, the hearing was adjourned until 10 a.m., Tuesday, May 25, 1971.)

○